DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 494 SP 025 528

AUTHOR Denemark, George
TITLE Educating a Profession.
PUB DATE 25 Oct 84
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Texas Conference on Teacher Education (37th, Fort Worth, TX, October 25, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; Educational Policy; *Educational Quality; Higher Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Program Improvement; *Schools of Education; Teacher Associations; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

Actions and reactions of some groups of individuals who have retarded rather than advanced the cause of excellence in teaching and teacher education are cited. Citizen representatives in policy-making bodies at national, state, and community levels do little to provide moral or financial support for the teaching profession, and frequently advocate stifling controls over teaching. Understanding of educational issues is often clouded by the media, which exaggerates problems and simplifies solutions. An inaccurate understanding of actual standards set for the teacher education curriculum and teacher certification often leads to unwarranted criticism, not only from the media but also from the academic professoriate in other disciplines in higher education. Higher education administrators also contribute to the problems of schools of education by underfunding education programs while putting a higher premium on other college or university programs. A lack of dedication to school improvement on the part of education faculty and classroom teachers is also evident. It is suggested that among individual professionals, and within institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies, greater willingness must be assumed to identify inadequate performance and take a strong stand for its correction or elimination. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED254494

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# EDUCATING A PROFFESSION

GEORGE DENEMARK

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George Denemark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP025528

# EDUCATING A PROFESSION[1]

George Denemark

In 1915 Abraham Flexner held that to be a profession in the genuine sense, something more than a mere claim or an academic degree is needed. Flexner, viewed by many as the father of modern medical education in the United States, went on to identify a number of characteristics of a profession, criteria that have endured in the literature on professions today.

In 1948, the National Labor Relations Act defined a professional as one

> engaged in work predominantly intellectual. . .involving the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment. . .of such a character that the output produced cannot be standardized. . .and requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study.

More detailed analyses of professions have followed, a number of them summarized in an AACTE publication, Educating a Profession, (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, Nash, 1976) on which I was privileged to work with my good friends and program participants, Bob Howsam and Dean Corrigan. All make clear Flexner's observation that not every occupation is or can be a profession. Thus, ballplayers are not members of a profession even though they are paid generous salaries. Nor are car painters or barbers professionals, in spite of their advertisements proclaiming professional results.

But what about teaching? Is teaching a profession? Does it really matter what we call teaching or how society chooses to think about it? Does it matter whether we view teaching as a craft or a profession? Is it important whether we think of teachers as technicians or professionals? As artists or scientists, or some combination of the two? Are schools best served by teachers prepared in an apprentice model common to many trades or through an internship model used in the

---

[1]An address to the 37th Annual Texas Conference on Teacher Education, Fort Worth, Texas, October 25, 1984. Denemark is Director of the Teacher Internship Project, Kentucky Department of Education and Professor of Education, University of Kentucky.

SP025528

professions? Are these distinctions largely a product of a semantic game with little practical import?

My answer to whether professional status for teaching matters is a resounding, unequivocal "yes". Yes, it matters a great deal, for how we think about things often influences their ultimate reality. As John Dewey observed long ago, ideals have a way of conditioning reality just as reality often shapes our ideals. The things to which we aspire become more likely of realization, in large measure because we actively seek them.

The essence of what I have to say to you this evening is that while teaching may fall short of full professional status, those of us committed to the importance of education in a free, democratic society cannot rest until the teaching of our children and youth attains the recognition and the quality it demands.

But we have a long, often discouraging, way to go. In 1948, the year of the NLRA definition mentioned a moment ago, I was a new doctoral student in curriculum at the University of Illinois. That was a year when Arthur Bestor, an eminent history professor at Illinois, was at his vitriolic best in denouncing the failures of our public schools, ascribing most of them to the stranglehold that education professors had on the preparation of teachers. His attacks culminated in a book, Educational Wastelands (1953), that joined Lynd's Quackery in the Public Schools and Mortimer Smith's The Diminished Mind in purveying gross oversimplifications of the problems of teaching and teacher education.

As one reviewer (Trow, 1954) of Bestor's Educational Wastelands pointed out,

> The reader runs constantly into such loaded value words as trivia, preposterous, inanity, nonsense, monstrosity, charlatan, sterile, vicious, wasted, unthinkable, hodgepodge, ineffectual, and unfounded, which make the writer's position clear, though with an impassioned self-involvement that. . .is less characteristic of scholarly writing than of campaign oratory.

In a subsequent interview carried in U. S. News and World Report (1956), Professor Bestor, that coldly objective scholar critic, held that "we are less educated than fifty years ago." Parenthetically, the late 1940's and early 1950's were also years when post-war teacher shortages became severe, with accompanying pressures to open the doors to any who might be interested in teaching, however inadequately prepared or motivated. It is interesting to note that thirty years later, however, in 1984, the teacher products of those "less educated" years were being referred to in a Rand report (Darling-Hammond, 1984) as "the current highly educated and experienced staff that is dwindling as older teachers retire and many younger teachers leave for other occupations."

Sadly, 1984 seems discouragingly like 1948 in the ignorance, distortion, or at best oversimplifications, that abound with respect to teaching and teacher education. The same kinds of words are evident, e.g. "the most scorned quasi-profession in America," "the biggest running joke in higher education," "would-be teachers. . .waltz into schools of education as if they were signing up for intramural softball," "irrelevant," "unrelievedly boring," "saying nothing well," "artificial hurdles," "intellectual ghettos," "educational pablum." It is obvious that special scorn is reserved for teacher education. Perhaps the size of the classroom teacher force and its recent growth in political power has caused some critics to focus their attacks on teacher education as a relatively ineffectual political force and, therefore, a safer and more vulnerable target.

While thinking of the nature of my remarks to you recently as I drove across Kentucky, I heard the car radio playing "Everything Old is New Again." How ironic! In many respects, teaching and its training arm, teacher education, seem as far from achieving real professional status in 1984 as was true in 1948. In fact, the increasing inroads of prescriptive laws and regulations affecting teachers may signal regression rather than progress. Am I nearing the conclusion of a career in edu-

cation that has spanned more than three decades only to find the same problems continuing to impede the maturing of our profession today as they did when I was a neophyte teacher?

At the risk of alienating absolutely everyone in the audience tonight, let me review a list of groups and actions by segments of these groups that have retarded rather than advanced the cause of excellence in teaching and teacher education and have blocked the maturing of teaching as a profession.

The first group is composed of citizens and their representatives in the policy making bodies at national, state, and community levels. Some among them seem more interested in "quick fixes" for educational problems than in long term solutions--more interested in oversimplified answers than in sober reflection on the merits of various alternatives. Convinced of the wisdom of their own views, these individuals pay little attention to the need for facts and accurate information.

Too many of this type share the general public's high expectations for teachers but do nothing to provide either the moral or financial support essential for achieving quality in our teaching force and ultimately in our schools. Public expectations of teachers were articulated neatly in a "want ad" written recently by the Rand Corporation (1984). It read as follows:

**WANTED:**

> College graduate with academic major (Master's Degree preferred). Excellent communication and leadership skills required. Challenging opportunity to serve 150 clients daily, developing up to five different products each day to meet their needs. This diversified job also allows employee to exercise typing, clerical, law enforcement, and social work skills between assignments and

> after hours. Adaptability is helpful, since suppliers cannot always deliver goods and support services on time. Typical work week is 47 hours. Special nature of work precludes fringe benefits such as lunch and coffee breaks, but work has many intrinsic rewards. Starting salary $12,769 with a guarantee of $24,000 after only 14 years.

Obviously the public wants an intellectual giant, a paragon of virtue, a totally dedicated professional with missionary instincts and a messianic zeal, all for less than $13,000 a year.

Rather than getting at the real roots of the problem, some citizens and policy makers find it comforting to blame teachers and teacher educators for the difficulties encountered in our schools, perhaps because it relieves them of their own responsibility for years of educational neglect. Yale University President Giamatti (1983) put it very well:

> While there are problems aplenty in the ways America educates its young people, they are problems stemming essentially from inattention by the leaders of the adult society to the means of education. The problems stem from inattention to teachers' material needs and professional circumstances; inattention to standards of excellence; inattention to the proposition that the socially disadvantaged have the deepest stake in the American educational dream and therefore deserve the most encouragement to pursue the education each must acquire for a full and free life; inattention to the physical safety in, and the physical facilities of, our schools; inattention to curricula that must meet ethical as well as technical challenges; inattention to the demands that a diverse population---one of the country's strengths---necessarily place on the means of education.
>
> It is inattention of long standing that cannot be papered over by a national habit of indulging in long-term planning for short-term gains, as if a consultant or a commission could, by recommending a result, enact a sensible solution for all time. . . . .Teachers have taken a battering recently, a battering all out of proportion to their responsibility.

One of the more vocal critics of teacher preparation is Texas' own Ross Perot who was quoted in the Washington Post (Keisling, 1984) recently as holding

that "of 65 education colleges in Texas, maybe 10 are worth anything", adding that "If this were a highway paving job, we'd call it fraud and throw the perpetrators in jail." At another point, Perot predicted that "five years from now the best teachers in Texas will have never set foot in an education school." Mr. Perot is a key member of the Texas Select Committee on Public Education.

While calling for more professional behavior from teachers, some citizens and legislators have advocated controls over teaching that effectively block professional development. As Diane Ravitch remarked, many teachers now express frustration that teaching has become less a profession and more a civil service job resulting from the endless amount of regulation and law imposed by government agencies. What other profession would tolerate the degree of control exercised by forces other than members of the profession themselves? We can hardly be critical of professional shortcomings in teaching if we are unwilling to grant to the profession the opportunity to exercise responsibility.

A frequent complaint of this uninformed corps of citizen and policy maker critics centers on "all those methods courses." The solution proposed is the requirement of some solid courses in subject matter, without taking time to find out that the typical candidate for a secondary school teaching certificate takes only about 19% of his or her baccalaureate program in pedagogy and about 71% in subject matter specialties and general education (33% and 38% respectively). The remaining portion of the baccalaureate is composed of electives. (Based on an analysis of the data presented in Standards and Certification Bodies in the Teaching Profession, 1983.)

Of the credits in pedagogy required by certification regulations for high school teaching, from six to ten are typically earned in student teaching. Significant portions of the course work in Education prior to student teaching involves field or clinical experiences in school settings. Kentucky, for example, requires a minimum of eight semester hours or twelve weeks of full day student teaching and at least 150 clock hours of classroom observation and participation before the

student teaching semester. In the remaining course time students are expected to gain understanding of human development, learning and motivation, classroom management, meeting needs of handicapped children in the regular classroom, testing and evaluation principles, curricular patterns in elementary and secondary schools, school law, instructional methods and materials, perspectives on the role of education in America, and much more. "All those courses", indeed!

The problems of public and policy maker understanding of educational issues is often clouded by the media--by Sunday supplement writers whose desire to make complex problems seem simple too often results in a kind of "bumper sticker" mentality that promotes either-or thinking. A prime example of this kind of disservice to public understanding of the issues in teacher preparation is the article entitled "How Not to Teach Teachers" in a recent Education Review section of The Washington Post (Keisling, 1984)---an article replete with oversimplifications such as "Education courses are time-consuming and take future teachers away from courses in the subjects they'll be teaching." Too bad the author wasn't aware that in Texas over 100 hours of a prospective teacher's 128 hour program is devoted to the teaching field and general education. while 24 hours are earmarked for professional study, nine of which are allotted to student teaching.

And too bad the author of the recent Newsweek article, "Why Teachers Fail" (Williams, et al, 1984), who wrote of graduation from teacher education programs "coming easy", wasn't aware of the Sandefur study (1984) reporting 32 states with mandates for some type of competency testing of teachers, or the AACTE survey finding that 64% of all reporting institutions used screening tests for admission to teacher education programs. Recently compiled data from Kentucky Colleges and universities disclose that of every 100 applicants for admission to teacher education, 71 are admitted, 64 survive the 2.5 grade point requirement in the academic major, in pedagogy, and overall at the time of student teaching, and an estimated 57 will meet the written exit examination requirements as graduation. That doesn't sound all that easy to me. I wonder how it compares with the screening process for

liberal arts degrees in the same schools?

Another group that seems to have elements that are more a part of the problem than of the solution to improved teaching in our schools is the academic professoriate in higher education. Some of this group seem never to have read their own institution's catalog as a basis for understanding policy and practice in teacher education. Once again we hear unfounded criticisms of teachers being prepared without adequate attention to subject matter. Just last week in Kentucky, for example, a distinguished historian from a university faculty spoke about the problems of education, including "all those methods courses" and then proceeded to recommend in a local newspaper that perhaps three or four methods courses would be sufficient, little realizing that what he was proposing had been standard practice in his own institution for more than a decade. This from a respected academician who is calling for the abolition of colleges of education because of their shabby practices.

A second favorite point of attack from hostile academicians centers on low standards for admission to teacher education programs and the consequent intellectual weakness of their graduates. I would take that expression of concern more seriously if I had not experienced a multi-year struggle with some of these "scholars" as I was attempting to gain their approval in Undergraduate Council and Senate sessions for upgrading the admission standards for our teacher education programs. At that time, the arguments of these "defenders of quality" seemed concentrated on maximizing student transfer options from one unit to another, or ensuring enrollments in their support courses for teacher education, and for maintaining teacher education as a "trash can" within the university that would keep them from having to bother with mediocre students. Some of these faculty were undoubtedly the same ones who, while bitterly criticizing the low quality of teaching and teachers in the schools, advised their brightest students against pursuing a teaching career because they were "too promising." They are

undoubtedly the ones who will never listen to the critical distinction between the ACT scores of high school seniors who express an interest in teaching as a possible college focus and those of the sophomores and juniors who qualify for admission to a teacher education program. The Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education compared the average ACT scores of Kentucky education students in twenty colleges and universities with the scores obtained by other college students in Kentucky and across the nation. Based on 1982-83 data, the average ACT score of students admitted to a teacher education program at the sophomore level in Kentucky was 19.1. This compared favorably with the ACT average score of 17.5 for all Kentucky freshmen and an average score of 18.4 for freshmen on a national scale. Yet critics persist in quoting the test score of high school seniors who say they intend to go into teaching. Such critics deliberately ignore the vast difference between intending to do something and actually doing it.

Another group responsible for some of the problems in teaching and teacher education are those higher education administrators who have perpetuated neglect of their institution's responsibility to the schools and to teacher preparation. In some instances, interest in teacher education came only as those programs generated student credit hour support for institutional budgets. Seldom, however, were the funds generated returned to the education programs. Too often, teacher preparation programs with important and expensive clinical components were funded at the level of lower division standard classes, or worse.

The success of football and basketball teams often seemed to loom larger to such administrators than the success of their teacher education graduates. Compared with any significant show of interest in the work of the Education faculty, the record of administrator attendance at athletic events, both at home and away underscored the low priority attached to school improvement.

Especially gratifying in the past year or two, however, have been statements

coming from chief administrators of some of our most prestigious universities regarding their commitment to the improvement of schooling and their affirmation of the importance of their schools of education in this process. Perhaps such statements will rub off on a wider circle of chief academic officers in other colleges and universities. Certainly if college presidents and academic vice presidents articulate their own commitment to the improvement of schooling and the legitimacy of their education unit as a facilitator of that objective, institutional faculty will be more disposed to their own involvement in teacher education and school improvement efforts.

Unfortunately, the problemsof the teaching profession do not reside entirely outside schools, colleges, and departments of education. They are aggravated by some Education faculty whose interests are far afield from schools and teacher preparation, and by others whose unwillingness to apply rigorous standards and expectations to prospective teachers discredits their institution and the profession. A depressing view of research and development in teacher education was presented by an English observer of American graduate schools of education (Judge, 1982). After visiting ten research universities, Judge concluded that the research efforts of most faculty in these institutions avoid the "messy" problems of schools and teaching and focus instead on their graduate specialties, often quite tangential to teacher education and to the improvement of practice in the schools. Although small in number, these institutions have markedly influenced others and in the process frequently have fostered neglect of teaching, of schools, and of initial teacher preparation. Following this lead, some Education faculty, finding the problems of teaching and school improvement difficult to address, have retreated from them to more esoteric but manageable research concerns that better fit the reward structure of the university. Many of these individuals prefer not

to be designated as teacher educators at all but instead categorized in terms of their specialty areas. Some give only perfunctory attention to undergraduate or beginning graduate instruction. Some are unwilling to devote any significant time to school service and improvement efforts and are reluctant to take on any broad, long term projects that necessitate collaboration with school personnel or individuals from other departments or disciplines. Such a response is understandable in relation to the realities of the reward structure in many universities but highly destructive in terms of the mission of an Education unit. These faculty are part of the problem rather than part of the solution because they avoid confronting the questions that are most in need of study.

Another Education faculty group that represents part of our problem is composed of individuals who, though well-intentioned, are unwilling to establish and enforce rigourous professional standards for the admission and retention of candidates for teaching. Such individuals seem more concerned with the welfare of the teacher candidates than with the pupils these candidates may later cheat out of important learning experiences because of incompetence. How can we ever establish a decent profession if those engaged in the preparation of candidates for teaching are unwilling to make the judgments necessary to ensure that young learners are taught by individuals who exemplify high standards as well as strong commitment? It is essential that we establish minimum standards below which none can enter training programs and below which none can be recommended for beginning teacher assignment.

Education deans and chairs must be willing to risk charges of infringement on academic freedom because of their regular monitoring of course syllabi and instruction. The preparation of teachers is too important to permit their time and ours to be wasted in classes that earn a "Mickey Mouse" evaluation from students. Education classes that reflect personal whims of the instructor rather than substantive support for course objectives that have been reviewed

and established by the faculty have no place in any professional program. Unfortunately, unchallenging curricula and ill-prepared instructors, however small a part of the total, serve to influence public opinion regarding the quality of all teacher preparation. While the irresponsibility of some of the charges that result are frustrating to those of us who have a broader perspective, such perceptions represent a reality that we must address. Our reputation is too important for a few to be permitted to tarnish the image of the many.

Some of the same faculty individuals may be equally unwilling to apply rigorous standards to institutional programs as they serve on accreditation teams, As a consequence, institutions may be allowed to continue in the preparation of teachers although they can demonstrate little commitment to the task and have allocated personnel and material resources that are grossly inadequate, often only half of what is expended for undergraduate students in all disciplines (Peseau, 1982).

Before leaving the Education faculty group, I want to express one other concern. Is there a way that we can recognize the need for reform in teacher education without the kind of overstated criticisms exemplified by Clark's (1984) claims that "no functional program exists for training secondary school teachers in the U. S." and that "there are no demonstrable differences between secondary school teachers trained in teacher training programs and those who walk in off the streets." Descriptions of the extended teacher program at the University of Kansas (Scannell, 1984) and PROTEACH, the new five year teacher education program at the University of Florida (Smith, Carroll, and Fry, 1984) in the same Kappan issue in which Clark's article appears, refute his statement. Further, the assumption that a fifth year program of teacher education, one that separates liberal from professional studies, is the wave of the future should be open to question. The heavily funded experiment with such programs in the 1960's offers little support

for the superiority of programs concentrating pedagogical study in a fifth graduate year over those providing closer linkage between subject matter studies and consideration of how those may be conceptualized and taught in elementary and secondary school classrooms throughout the upper division and graduate years.

Classroom teachers, too, represent a part of the problem of improving schooling and building a profession, as well as being an essential ingredient for its solution. Some teachers' dismissal of the importance of a knowledge base undergirding instructional practice means that their performance rests upon a narrow, highly personalized view of teaching rather than upon a broad professional base rooted in research and shared practice. The teacher who is content to limit teaching behavior to those practices that grow out of personal experience rather than from the systematically accumulated wisdom of the profession is likely to judge the worth of a preparation program on the basis of a single exposure. And those who justify their performance solely on the basis of individual experience, rejecting any commitment to a professional knowledge base or their preparation program, leave themselves vulnerable to critics' attacks because they stand alone.

As Judge (1982) observed, however, "Teachers in the United States have long (perhaps always) been severely limited in the exercise of anything that might be considered professional autonomy. School boards, directly and through appointed superintendents, expect to resolve all important questions related to educational policy and practice." And Ravitch (1983) expressed concern over the state of the teaching profession, concluding that "with so many laws and regulations and interest groups on the scene, wise teachers look for protection to the rulebook, their union, their lawyer, or to some job with more dignity."

Professional organizations must also assume a share of responsibility for the current problems relating to teaching and to teacher education. Some teacher organizations have been willing to neglect instructional concerns and instructional

leadership in their effort to have an impact on salaries and welfare matters. Others have been reluctant to exert any control over members who have performed inadequately---indeed, have sometimes provided major support for organization members who seem clearly marginal in their performance.

While commenting frequently on inadequacies of teacher education programs few organization leaders have been willing to take strong stands on the need for more extended and more rigorous preparation programs.

Another problem at the organizational level is the reluctance to recommend the elimination of programs or institutions engaged in teacher preparation whose commitment and resource allocation are inadequate to ensure quality personnel preparation. The recent Feistritzer report suggests that perhaps half of the present programs of teacher preparation should be eliminated. While I have no basis for endorsing those specifics, we must find ways of eliminating institutional participation where the resources and commitment to mount quality programs are absent.

The obligation for selection and screening extends to state departments of education as well, for they are charged with the responsibility of reviewing programs of teacher preparation and institutions operating those programs. Yet seldom do these reviews result in the suspending of the authority to offer programs, even when it is obvious that the track record of the institution is inadequate. Perhaps the proximity of the reviewers to those institutions and individuals under review leads to deliberate avoidance of the conflict that might result from negative decisions.

What I have been suggesting is that among individual professionals, within institutions, and through our professional organizations and government agencies we must assume a greater willingness to identify inadequate performance and take a strong stand for its correction or elimination. The failure to address this problem will assure the continued criticism of teaching and teacher education---and properly so.

Last February at the AACTE conference in San Antonio, I spoke of my discouragement at being forced to ride in the back of the academic bus with other teacher educators for most of my professional life. I spoke, too, of being disavowed by some of my upwardly mobile colleagues in Education who were unwilling to address the demanding challenges associated with helping teachers improve schools. And I expressed frustration with other colleagues who seemed reluctant to apply the rigorous standards essential to a strong profession. But I concluded those remarks in a more positive vein and I wish to conclude tonight as well with brief mention of some of the important accomplishments and satisfactions we have experienced.

One that springs to mind immediately is the growth and enrichment of the knowledge base undergirding teaching and teacher education. I concur heartily with AACTE President David Smith's declaration (1983) that "the body of Knowledge about teaching and learning is today more substantive, consistent, and authoritative than ever before." (Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators, AACTE, 1983) Nathaniel Gage (1984) has commented that "research has shown repeatedly that it is possible to change teaching practices enough to make an educationally important difference" (Phi Delta Kappan, 1984) and asserts that "We are beginning to have evidence that changing teaching practice causes desirable changes in student achievement, attitude and conduct."

In the same issue of the Kappan, David Berliner (1984) another distinguished educational researcher, holds that "we have only recently developed a solid body of knowledge and a fresh set of conceptions about teaching on which to base teacher education. For the first time teacher education has a scientific foundation." But, he laments, "now that we are capable of monumental reform in teacher education, reform guided by research, we hear only calls for the reduction or total elimination of teacher preparation programs."

A second important accomplishment within the last decade has been our awakened sense of responsibility toward meeting the special learning needs of the handicapped and culturally different. Our profession and our society have made great strides toward realizing a commitment to the quality of education for all children and youth. That commitment is exemplified by our advocacy of equal opportunity, unlimited access, unconditional acceptance and responsiveness to individual differences. The mandate of Public Law 94-142 has stimulated significant changes in teaching and teacher education, changes that can ultimately serve to maximize the potential of each individual.

A third heartening development in recent years has been the growing together of two vital components of the teaching profession---those who teach in our elementary and secondary schools and those who staff the training arm of the profession in our colleges and universities. While much remains to be accomplished, the evidences of collaborative efforts between classroom and college personnel are encouraging. Teachers are serving on curriculum committees of colleges of education. Genuine cooperative efforts are evident in state teacher education and certification policy boards, and in such agencies as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Collaboration among components of the profession is absolutely essential, for when we speak to policy makers with many conflicting voices we are ignored in favor of others with perhaps far less commitment and knowledge about what makes educational sense, but with no reluctance to speak out.

A fourth promising development is illustrated by the presidents of six prestigious universities call for active involvement of higher education in school improvement, holding that universities must play an active role if they are to insure excellence in a full-access system of primary and secondary schools. (University, School Links Urged, 1983).

Stanford President Kennedy (1981), in an address to the Carnegie Foundation voiced his conviction that "there can be no more important entry in the public policy agenda of the United States than the quality of our primary and secondary educational systems. . .Only if the best institutions care about schools and their own schools of education will the public think they are worth caring about, and nothing could be more clearly the business of America's academic leaders."

Each of the constituencies affecting teaching and teacher education can contribute to the solution of our problems---to the creation of a recognized and effective teaching profession. The efforts of each will be strengthened as they find ways of working collaboratively with other constituencies. All will benefit from granting to teachers a degree of autonomy and freedom from regulation that encourages the assumption of responsibility. All will benefit from a willingness to consider alternatives openly and by taking time to get the facts rather than acting on the basis of prejudgment or oversimplification. All will benefit by societal and higher education commitments of resources to teachers and teacher preparation essential to meeting the demands of a complex profession. All will benefit from a linkage between higher education and the schools that puts to work the research potential of higher education on the urgent problems of the schools. And all will benefit from a shared commitment to high standards and rigorous enforcement of those standards---standards concerned with the potential for learning of our children and youth.

In 1976 the authors of the AACTE Bicentennial Report acknowledged the persuasiveness of Etzioni's analysis of teaching as a semi-profession. At the same time we urged action toward achieving the status of a mature profession ---a status consistent with the life and death importance of teaching. We held that "proper professional decisions enhance learning and life; improper decisions send the learner toward incremental death in openness to experience and in ability

to learn and contribute." (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark & Nash, 1976). Today the profession of teaching and its training arm are perhaps more seriously challenged than at any time in the last half century. To combat new threats to teacher autonomy/responsibility and to rebuff attempts to downgrade teacher education we must redouble our efforts to make teaching a profession in the fullest sense---not because of what that status will mean for us as individuals, but rather because of its import for the quality and character of teaching and learning in our schools.

Does it really matter to what we aspire and how we are viewed by the larger society? It matters more than ever today. Our aspirations and our energies must be merged in a renewed effort to realize the potential of teachers and of schooling in America. And the best way to build the profession's reputation may be to restore its sense of idealism.

On the wall of a small Vermont coffee shop our Commission, while working on the Bicentennial Report, enjoyed a folk saying that read, "Everything cometh to he who waiteth, so long as he who waiteth worketh like hell while he waiteth." That seemed to us to sum up very well how educators needed to confront the task that faced them. With only minor alteration that saying can summarize my remarks tonight. "Everything comes to those who aspire, so long as they work like hell while they aspire."

## REFERENCES


Berliner, D. "Making the Right Changes in Preservice Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, 66 (2).

Bestor, A. Educational Wastelands. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1953.

Clark, D. "Better Teachers for the Year 2000: A Proposal for the Structural Reform of Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, 66 (2).

Darling-Hammond, L. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teacher Education. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1984.

Gage, N. "What Do We Know About Teaching Effectiveness?" Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, 66 (2).

Giametti, A. B. "The Great Education Panic," The Washington Post, September 13, 1983.

Howsam, R., Corrigan, D., Denemark, G. & Nash, R. Educating a Profession. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Interview with Professor Arthur Bestor. "We are Less Educated Than 50 Years Ago," U. S. News & World Report, November 30, 1956.

Judge, H. American Graduate Schools of Education. New York: Ford Foundation, 1982.

Keisling, P. "How Not to Teach Teachers," The Washington Post, August 12, 1984.

Kennedy, D. Advancing Knowledge. Paper presented to the 75th Anniversary Colloquim of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, November 23, 1981.

Peseau, B. "Developing an Adequate Resource Base for Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 33 (4).

Ravitch, D. "Scapegoating the Teachers," The New Republic, November 7, 1983.

Sandefur, J. T. Standards for Admission to Teacher Education Programs. A paper prepared for the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, August 11, 1984.

Scannell, D. "The Extended Teacher Education Program at the University of Kansas," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, 66 (2).

Smith, D. (editor) Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983.

Smith, D., Carroll, R. & Fry, B. "PROTEACH: Professional Teacher Preparation at the University of Florida," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, 66 (2).

Standards and Certification Bodies in the Teaching Profession. Washington: National Education Association, 1983.

Trow, W. "Academic Utopia?" Educational Theory, 1954, 4, (1).

"University, School Links Urged," Education Week, August 24, 1983.

Williams, D., Howard, L., McDonald, D. & Michael, R. "Why Teachers Fail," Newsweek, September 24, 1984.